

Table S1. Summary of outcome data RCTs

Study, year, country, design	Non-physician	Physician	Risk ratio M-H, Random (95 % CI)
Outcome 1. Effectiveness - complete TOP (no need for surgical interventions)			
Klingberg-Allvin, 2014, Uganda, e-RCT	29 MW PP: 452/472	13 P PP: 467/483	MW group vs P group PP*: 0.99 (0.97, 1.02)
Kopp Kallner, 2014, Sweden, e-RCT	2 NMW ITT: <i>Not available</i> PP: 476/481	34 P ITT: <i>Not available</i> PP: 445/457	NMW group vs P group ITT: <i>Not available</i> PP: 1.02 (1.00, 1.03)
Olavarietta, 2014, Mexico, ni-RCT	7 N ITT: 425/434 PP: 386/395	8 P ITT: 443/450 PP: 401/406	N group vs P group ITT: 0.99 (0.98, 1.01) PP: 0.99 (0.97, 1.01)
Warriner, 2011, Nepal, e-RCT	8 N + 3 ANM ITT: 504 /518 PP: 490/504	14 P ITT: 494/514 PP: 455/472	N+ANM group vs P group ITT: 1.01 (0.99, 1.04) PP: 1.01 (0.99, 1.03)
Outcome 2. Safety - serious adverse events (blood transfusion, hospitalization, deaths)			
Klingberg-Allvin, 2014, Uganda, e-RCT	29 MW PP: 0/472	13 P PP: 0/483	MW group vs P group PP: <i>Not estimable</i>
Kopp Kallner, 2014, Sweden, e-RCT	2 NMW ITT: <i>Not available</i> PP: 0/473	34 P ITT: <i>Not available</i> PP: 0/443	NMW group vs P group ITT: <i>Not available</i> PP: <i>Not estimable</i>
Olavarietta, 2014, Mexico, ni-RCT	7N ITT: 0/434 PP: 0/395	8 P ITT: 1/450 PP: 0/406	N group vs P group ITT: <i>Not estimable</i> PP: <i>Not estimable</i>
Warriner, 2011, Nepal, e-RCT	8 N + 3 ANM ITT: 0 /518 PP: 0/504	14 P ITT: 0/514 PP: 0/472	N+ ANM group vs P group ITT: <i>Not estimable</i> PP: <i>Not estimable</i>
Outcome 3. Acceptability – satisfaction with provider			
A. Would you recommend the treatment/provider to a friend (YES)? Would you prefer the same provider of future procedures of termination of pregnancy (YES and INDIFFERENT)?			
Cleeve, 2016, Uganda, e-RCT	29 MW PP: 465 /472	13 P PP: 477/482	MW group vs P group PP*: 1.00 (0.98, 1.01)
Kopp Kallner, 2014, Sweden, e-RCT	2 NMW ITT: 471/534	34 P ITT: 332/533	NMW group vs P group ITT: 1.42 (1.32, 1.52)
Olavarietta, 2014, Mexico, ni-RCT	7N ITT: 427/434	8 P ITT: 444/450	N group vs P group ITT: 1.00 (0.98, 1.01)
B. How satisfied are you with the provider (SATISFIED and VERY SATISFIED)? Overall acceptability (SATISFACTORY).			
Cleeve, 2016, Uganda, e-RCT	29 MW PP: 449/472	13 P PP: 455/482	MW group vs P group PP: 1.01 (0.98, 1.04)
Olavarietta, 2014, Mexico, ni-RCT	7N ITT: 433/434	8 P ITT: 448/450	N group vs P group ITT: 1.00 (0.99, 1.01)

* The population is marginally different between PP and ITT thus the same population used in both the PP and ITT analysis

Abbreviations 95% CI 95 % confidence interval; e-RCT, equivalence randomized controlled trial; ITT, intention-to-treat analysis; ANM, auxiliary nurse midwives; M-H, Mantel-Haenszel random-effects models; MW, midwives, N, nurses; NMW, nurse midwives; ni-RCT; non-inferiority randomized controlled trial; P, physicians; PP, per protocol analysis ; TOP, termination of pregnancy